**Florida Children and Youth Cabinet Technology Workgroup Meeting**

**Friday, April 15, 2016**

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Betty Easley Conference Center, Room #178

4075 Esplanade Way, Tallahassee, Florida

**Meeting Summary**

Note: The following is a summary of the highlights of the proceedings and is not intended to be construed as a transcript. To obtain meeting materials, please visit [www.flgov.com/childrens- cabinet.](http://www.flgov.com/childrens-cabinet)

**Attendance Summary**

Florida Children and Youth Cabinet Technology Workgroup members in attendance:

* Chair Victoria Vangalis Zepp, Florida Children and Youth Cabinet Member
* Marc Slager, Department of Children and Families
* Melanie May, Office of Early Learning
* Michael Magnuson, Agency for Health Care Administration
* Stephanie Brown, Agency for Persons with Disabilities
* Greg Ramsey, Guardian ad Litem

Guests in attendance:

* Maureen Olson, Agency for State Technology
* Deborah Stevens, Agency for State Technology
* Dr. Patty Babcock, Institute for Child Welfare

Guests via Phone:

* Dr. Mary Armstrong, Executive Director, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute -USF
* Charles Dion, University of South Florida, Mental Health Law & Policy

Staff in attendance:

* Tim Parson

Meeting Start Time: 3:00 p.m.

Meeting End Time: 4:55 p.m.

**Proceedings**

**Call to Order and Welcome**

Chair Victoria Zepp called the Florida Children and Youth Cabinet Technology Workgroup meeting to order and welcomed everyone in attendance.

The roll was called by Tim Parson and a quorum was confirmed.

Chair Zepp recapped previously identified goals that support the overall Cabinet’s goals which include providing ease of use access for the citizenry when searching agency sites for information, enabling leading edge technology applications that reduce trauma and improve the quality of life for children and to support participating agency’s critical operational data and technology solutions that enable each respective agency’s deliverables/business services through improved data agreements, interfaces, collaboration, etc. She pointed out that some barriers, including human, statutory and resource allocation do exist. To better understand how to achieve efficacy from an operational standpoint a detailed ‘state of the state’ data sharing profile must be created that identifies what data exists, how, why, by whom and under what terms that data is shared between agencies, research organizations and private partners will be a key priority of the technology workgroup.

This “state of the state” data sharing profile will be a long-term project due to the rigorous review and outreach that will be needed for an inclusive and detailed profile that can be valuable to each agency and the Cabinet as well.

The Chair then stated that currently Florida’s data resides in multiple information systems that are unrelated, within one agency and more so across agencies. Plus, the data in these systems are most often considered stand alone and are not interoperable, the data may or may not be collected consistently with one person entered as multiple records for various reasons. This lack of data consistency creates challenges for data comparison and reporting of inter- and intra-agency initiatives that typically lead to errors in data use.

The Chair clarified that a data dictionary is a tool to help create data rules to enable greater interoperability, within and across the agencies. A data dictionary provides a descriptive list of names, definitions, and attributes of data elements to be captured in an information system or database. It describes the definitions or the expected meaning and acceptable representation of data for use within a defined context of data elements within a data set, including what values it may contain. Basically, this guides what the data item means and how its used in real-world terms across all identified databases, including outlines best practices for maintaining data integrity to help ensure data accuracy.

Chair Zepp reviewed the minutes of the last meeting. The group then briefly discussed the ‘state of the state’ data profile Excel template created by Maureen Olson of AST. Specifically, that a column was added to captured the costs associated any sharing data agreement and if they had any edits. The group also discussed the interagency agreement that needs to be reviewed and updated as well as renewed.

Chair Zepp reminded the group that completing the ‘state of the state’ template would be a long-term project that is expected to take months to complete. She encouraged everyone to review it and provide their feedback on the identified headers and time to complete.

**Action item #1: Each agency to review the draft Technology Workgroup template headers with key staff to ensure the right data elements are tracked and identify a realistic timeline for completion.**

**Florida Children and Youth Cabinet (FCYC) Technology Workgroup**

Chair Zepp then laid out the workgroup’s short-term and long-term goals. Short-term the workgroup will assist in updating the MOU which will help in determining what we are sharing and where the gaps currently are. As for long-term goals, the workgroup would consider the allocation of resources and helping agencies determine who is responsible for providing services for a given child.

Marc Slager expressed concern of doing historical research as a group goals. For example, stating that for DCF it would be complicated to pull all this information together and suggested an alternative goals due to time restraints maybe more beneficial and provide “supply side” advantages. As for “demand side”, to review the Cabinet’s priorities and look at whether we do share the data. First, look at what would be deliverable to the Cabinet, then solve problems using this process and lastly add legitimacy to something based on faith. We can characterize it based upon something good.

Chair Zepp expressed that this approach mirrors the workgroups plan and why Dr. Patty Babcock with the Institute for Child Welfare was a key guest at today’s meeting. The priorities in the user case document, that was presented to this workgroup in the last meeting, was created by Institute researchers and FCYC’s Workgroup for Alignment to Children and Youth Focus Areas and Headline Indicators.

After reviewing a copy of the user case priorities, Mr. Slager noted that DCF listed cases are too broad, simply i.e., SAMH, child welfare and eligibility. His concern is in providing quality specific intelligence. Chair Zepp thanked Mr. Slager for sharing concerns given that the afore mentioned mapping is producing the user cases. Stressing critical review of the mapping to ensure it reflects real business needs of the agency is exactly what we must do.

From the discussion, Chair Zepp requested Stephanie Brown share a status on the work of FCYC’s Workgroup for Alignment to Children and Youth Focus Areas and Headline Indicators. Stephanie advised that working with the Institute an initial asset mapping from an enterprise approach was completed, however to Mr. Slager’s point the user case examples were to broad. Therefore, the workgroup was taking a step back to create a second survey to detail specific cross-agency issues/barriers to overcome that clearly reflect the cabinet’s headline indicators. Resurveying will take a few more months to complete. Their workgroup will keep in close communications with us.

Mr. Slager restated concerns for the workgroup to begin by answering questions related to Cabinet’s priorities to ensure delivering a win to the Cabinet. The Chair clarified that wins have been achieved by identifying multiple redundant activities and shared lessons that already have taken place. The plan is exactly he’s requesting, mirrors whats been proposed by the workgroup. She clarified that the FCYC has a Workgroup for Alignment to Children and Youth Focus Areas and Headline Indicators - those priorities are driving the user cases being referenced as examples of current cross-agency challenges with barriers to overcome that can help achieve the priority headline indicator goals. She asked the workgroup to think of user cases will include short and long term goals aimed to address indicators and that creation a ‘state of the state’ data usage profile to identify all current data sharing from historical to present day is a long-term goal. With the additional clarification, Mr. Slager agreed with the approach.

**Guest Presentations: USF**

Charles Dion and Dr. Mary Armstrong. Mr. Dion gave an overview of his department and focus of their work and shared that this Department was founded in 1984 and he became Director in 2008. Their partners are owners of Florida specific data sources, such as Baker Act data, AHCA Medicaid data, and Pinellas County homeless data. To see these and other specific data source projects, he encouraged visiting their website.

Chair Zepp questioned if they perform data integrity checks, cleaning, and deduping on agency data files and then provide back to the agency all data integrity changes/updates. Charles indicated that they do said quality improvements to the data, but don’t typically send it back to the agency. Yet, he advised they are willing to return the cleaned and matched data elements if requested. Mr. Dion added that they match using multiple identifiers that include social security numbers, if available, and that their software is capable of identifying missing information correctly at an extremely high match rate of 95%.

Chair Zepp followed up sharing with workgroup members the usual and customary business-to-business trade tape protocol that agencies could use. She encouraged adding a written expectation in data agreements that any integrity data updates must be shared back with the agency. This was met with great interest by agency representatives. They all took note to request more information on receiving data integrity information back for existing projects.

Chair Zepp pointed out the need to make all agencies aware that universities are not bound by the same federal rules that agencies are related to usage and sharing of data, therefore they offer key strategic partnership opportunities for issue specific research or analytics. Dr. Armstrong also noted that there are different research departments within each university offering unique subject matter data driven research and expertise.

Dr. Mary Armstrong then presented a FMHI project overview that was included in the published meeting materials. The project outlined how they were using state data to accomplish a review that was outlined by an executive order Governor Scott issued on October 15, 2016. The order designated DCF as the lead agency to pilot a review toward identifying Substance Abuse and Mental Health (SAMH) service delivery measures. SAMH services are funded through local, state, and federal dollars and FMHI will detail how well these services are being delivered and integrated for high-end users/patients with a focus on care coordination. The three counties participating in the pilot are Alachua, Broward and Pinellas.

Chair Zepp pointed out that the Cabinet’s ‘state of the state’ profile will also work to identify who has data ownership when a child enters the system. She inquired if they are able to highlight data ownership by agency. Dr. Armstrong replied that the Executive Order focuses specifically on service coordination across state agencies, instead of data coordination and they will tell who is paying for services, but not how, nor if those funds were spent effectively. Dr. Armstrong agreed there need is critical to establish rules and to determine a primary owner of the data for a person served by multiple agencies, but that task requires a new and tremendously complex specific project with the data center. It would be difficult for any entity to do for that matter. Dr. Armstrong further stressed that multiple states are currently struggling to determine a primary account manager process.

Michael Magnuson cited Florida needs a mechanism similar to the National Accuracy Clearinghouse (NAC) that can use unique identifiers per a source system and number. The NAC currently runs queries to identify fraud, yet the same process could also be used for data integrity.

Dr. Patty Babcock pointed out that once you have established a relationship, the question is how do you get output based off a family and then also how do you automatically connect the dots between databases related to the family? For example, once you input and connect to other systems, do we ever then go back to see what we learned from how we’ve handled this case record?

Focusing on the person or “who are you and how are you related to Florida agencies” versus what services are you calling today for? In other words, leading with identifying who the person or family that needs assistance as the first priority. Then with key indicators match that person across multiple unique systems.

Mr. Magnuson advised that currently AHCA gets list of data requests, but does not request anything in return. He acknowledged it would be useful that once this data is enriched, if they were then able to access and use that data and recommended that all agencies modify their MOU’s to use Chair Zepp’s suggestion to add a written expectation in agreements that vendor/partners provide any data integrity changes/updates back to the agency. Mr. Magnuson also took immediate action email his agency team on the new expectation.

Following the presentation, Chair Zepp discussed next steps were for this workgroup, along with the Institute, and Workgroup on Alignment to look at the Children’s Cabinet’s indicators, the agency identified priorities and to ensure this workgroup is operating in tandem with aligned priorities. Additionally, we should review a data accuracy model for Florida such as the national clearinghouse model. Such a model would be outlined in the data dictionary as a standard means of identifying key field indicators of data sets that are consistent across all state agencies and entities engaged in sharing agreements.

Chair Zepp then recognized the great work and resources that Dr. Patty Babcock has created at the Florida Institute of Child Welfare. Dr. Babcock further shared that the institute, while housed at Florida State University, is a joint collaboration of thirteen universities all with Colleges of Social Work and researchers to access as needed.

Related to creation of a data dictionary and a multi-agency sharing protocol, Dr. Babcock recommended looking at the Connecticut Model as an example of data collaboration on merging data sets toward the best outcomes for children. Then she offered to have Institute graduate students explore how Connecticut and other states are addressing data integrity and sharing. In addition, using the Institute’s researchers and their analytical Qualtrics data system Dr. Babcock will build a standard for data collection for the ‘state of the state’ profile at no cost.

Melanie May, Office of Early Learning advised that her team was already working on the excel template. Dr. Babcock assured us that data already entered into the existing excel template can be uploaded into Qualtrics.

**Action item#2: Work with Dr. Babcock and the Institute to the Connecticut’s and other states data collaborative public-private partnership as example of open and accessible data that can drive planning, policy, budgeting and decision making.**

**Action item#3: Incorporate the Technology Workgroup data template into Qualtrics to provide access to the workgroup to enter data.**

In closing, Chair Zepp recapped long-term and short-term priorities. In the long-term, the workgroup could focus on creating a “state of the state” for data collection. And in the short-term, the workgroup could establish a data accuracy model similar to the national clearinghouse. As well as work toward identified user cases.

Lastly, Chair Zepp introduced future meeting dates as newly listed in the agenda. There were no noted conflicts. She then announced that the next workgroup meeting on May 20th, will be after the full Cabinet May 4, 2016 meeting. The full Cabinet meeting agenda includes Technology Workgroup, Workgroup Alignment, and Interagency Services Coordination updates which should provide greater insight into the expectations of the role in the inter-agency agreement and toward the direction of our actions and focus thus far.

Dr. Armstrong did reiterate the recommendation to reach out to universities as data partners.

**Public Comment**

No members of the public wished to speak.

**Adjournment**

With no other business and an announcement that an agenda will be provided in advance of the next meeting the meeting was adjourned at: 4:55 p.m.